UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/882,917	06/15/2001	Cary Lee Bates	ROC920010074US1	9773

7590 03/22/2004

Gero G. McClellan
Thomason, Moser & Patterson, L.L.P.
Suite 1500
3040 Post Oak Boulevard
Houston, TX 77056-6582

EXAMINER	
LEROUX, ETIENNE PIERRE	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2171	4

DATE MAILED: 03/22/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/882,917	BATES ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Etienne P LeRoux	2171	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *06 January 2004* .

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-26* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-26* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *15 June 2001* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: .

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1-4, 6-8, 10-13, 15, 16, 18-21 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by US Pat No 6,266,684 issued to Kraus et al (hereafter Kraus).

3. Claims 1, 10, 21 and 26:

Kraus discloses a method of formatting an electronic document comprising at least two frames each containing searchable text, comprising:

- receiving a response containing the electronic document *[web page 50, Fig 2 and col 3, lines 45-55]*
- automatically designating one of the at least two frames as a default search frame based on a pre-existing specification of the default search frame *[target second frame 64, Fig 7 and col 6, lines 23-38]*
- rendering the electronic document for display *[Fig 7]*

Claims 2, 11, 13, 18 and 20:

Kraus discloses wherein the electronic document is a web page, wherein the response is received from the Internet and wherein at least the automatically designating and rendering are performed by a browser [abstract and col 1, lines 5-36]

Claims 3 and 19:

Kraus discloses wherein automatically designating occurs one of before rendering and after rendering [target second frame 64, Fig 7 and col 6, lines 23-38]

Claims 4 and 12:

Kraus discloses wherein automatically designating occurs without an explicit selection of the default search frame by a user [col 6, lines 23-38].

Claims 6 and 15:

Kraus discloses wherein automatically designating comprises selecting from the at least two frames a frame previously selected for a content search [col 6, lines 23-38]

Claim 7:

Kraus discloses wherein automatically designating comprises selecting from the at least two frames according to an attribute of the at least two frames [col 6, lines 23-38]

Claims 8 and 16:

Kraus discloses wherein automatically designating comprises one of selecting from the at least two frames a frame containing a greater amount of content and selecting a largest frame from the at least two frames [col 6, lines 23-38].

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kraus in view of US Pat No 6,230,171 issued to Pacifici et al (hereafter Pacifici).

Claim 5:

Kraus discloses the elements of claim 1 as noted above.

Kraus fails to disclose wherein automatically designating comprises parsing the response to locate a default search frame identifier.

Pacifici discloses wherein automatically designating comprises parsing the response to locate a default search frame identifier [Fig 4]

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Kraus to include wherein automatically designating comprises parsing the response to locate a default search frame identifier as taught by Pacifici.

The ordinarily skilled artisan would have been motivation to modify Kraus to include the above for the purpose of instructing the browser regarding display of the data received from the server.

6. Claims 9, 17 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kraus in view of Pub No US 2002/0120505 issued to Henkin et al (hereafter Henkin)

Claims 9, 17 and 25:

Kraus discloses the elements of claims 1 and 21 as noted above.

Kraus fails to disclose highlighting the default search frame.

Henkin '505 discloses highlighting the default search frame [paragraph 183].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Kraus to include highlighting the default search frame as taught by Henkin '505.

The ordinarily skilled artisan would have been motivated to modify Kraus to include highlighting the default search frame for the purpose of selecting the frame for possible for processing.

7. Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kraus in view of Pub No US 2002/0065110 issued to Enns et al (hereafter Enns).

Claim 14:

Kraus discloses the elements of claim 10.

Kraus fails to disclose wherein automatically designating comprises parsing the response to locate a default search frame tag.

Enns discloses wherein automatically designating comprises parsing the response to locate a default search frame tag [paragraph 58].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Kraus to include wherein automatically designating comprises parsing the response to locate a default search frame tag as taught by Enns.

The ordinarily skilled artisan would have been motivated to modify Kraus as above for the purpose of controlling the browser display [paragraph 58].

8. Claims 22 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kraus in view of Pub No US 2003/0028850 issued to Quinn et al (hereafter Quinn).

Claims 22 and 23:

Kraus discloses the elements of claim 21 as noted above.

Kraus fails to disclose wherein the program is a browser and the default search frame code segment is an HTML tag.

Quinn discloses wherein the program is a browser and the default search frame code segment is an HTML tag [paragraph 68].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Kraus to include wherein the program is a browser and the default search frame code segment is an HTML tag as taught by Quinn.

The ordinarily skilled artisan would have been motivated to modify Kraus per the above for the purpose of providing a user with the ability to edit an electronic file [abstract].

9. Claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kraus in view of Pub No US 2002/0129064 issued to Guthrie (hereafter Guthrie).

Claim 24:

Kraus discloses the elements of claim 21 as noted above.

Kraus fails to disclose wherein the default search frame code segment is an attribute of a FRAMESET tag.

Guthrie discloses wherein the default search frame code segment is an attribute of a FRAMESET tag [paragraph 11].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Kraus to include wherein the default search frame code segment is an attribute of a FRAMESET tag as taught by Guthrie.

The ordinarily skilled artisan would have been motivated to modify Kraus per the above for the purpose of providing sufficient information to generate an instance of the injectable component [paragraph 11].

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments, filed 1/6/2004 with respect to claims 1-26 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Etienne LeRoux whose telephone number is (703) 305-0620. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday – Friday from 8:00 AM to 4:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Safet Metjahic, can be reached on (703) 308-1436.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Etienne LeRoux

March 16, 2004

SAFET METJAHIC
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100